

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-61 are pending in the present application. Claims 46-56 and 59-61 are allowed. Claims 1-45, 57 and 58 are rejected. Claim 7 is objected to. Claims 1, 7, 12, 20, 25, 32, and 57 have been amended. Claim 45 has been canceled.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 stands objected to because of informalities. Claim 7 has been amended to correct this informality. The language "enabling error detection" has been changed to "enabling detection of a condition that identifies as an error."

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 57 has been amended to correct this deficiency. The language "header is start code" has been changed to "header start code."

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-11, 20, 21 and 25-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nuber et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,742,623), hereinafter "Nuber." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Amended Claim 1 recites a method of handling errors in a system for receiving packet streams, the method including the steps of: enabling detection of a condition that identifies as an error a packet stream that is scrambled, the enabling by asserting a field of a register; determining if a received packet is scrambled; and performing an error recovery operation.

Nuber discloses error detection and recovery for high rate isochronous data in MPEG-2 data streams. Nuber also discloses that one field included in each isodata transport packet is a field that contains two transport_scrambling control bits, indicating whether the data in the transport packet is encrypted.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly indicate that the enabling is by asserting a field of a register (and not that the scrambling is by asserting a field of a register). Nuber does not disclose or suggest enabling detection of a condition that identifies as an error a packet stream that is scrambled, the enabling by asserting a field of a register as recited in Claim 1.

Because Nuber neither discloses nor suggests a method as recited in Claim 1, Claim 1 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Nuber. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 1 is respectfully solicited. Claims 2-11 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 2-11 include additional patentable subject matter.

Amended Claim 20 recites a method of handling errors in a system for receiving a packet stream, the method including the steps of: enabling detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field of a register, the condition that identifies a continuity discrepancy as a recognized error; determining if the continuity discrepancy exists by the substeps of: receiving a continuity count from a first packet; receiving a continuity count from a second packet; determining if the continuity discrepancy exists based upon the continuity counts from the first and second packet; and performing an error recovery operation when a discrepancy exists.

Nuber does not disclose or suggest enabling detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field of a register, the condition that identifies a continuity discrepancy as a recognized error as recited in Claim 20.

The Office has not shown where Nuber discloses determining if the continuity discrepancy exists by the substeps of: receiving a continuity count from a first packet; receiving

a continuity count from a second packet; determining if the continuity discrepancy exists based upon the continuity counts from the first and second packet as recited in Claim 20.

Because Nuber neither discloses nor suggests a method as recited in Claim 20, Claim 20 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Nuber. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 20 is respectfully solicited. Claim 21 depends from allowable Claim 20 and is allowable for at least this reason. Claim 21 includes additional patentable subject matter.

Amended Claim 25 recites a method of handling errors in a system for receiving packetized elementary streams, the method comprising the steps of: enabling detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field in a register, the condition that identifies syntax errors in a packetized elementary stream as a recognized error; determining if a syntax error exists by receiving a header portion of a packetized elementary stream; determining if a predetermined syntax condition of the header portion is met, where the syntax error exists if the syntax conditions are not met; and performing an error recovery operation when a syntax error exists.

The Office has not shown where Nuber discloses enabling detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field in a register, the condition that identifies syntax errors in a packetized elementary stream as a recognized error. Nuber does not disclose or suggest enabling detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field in a register, the condition that identifies syntax errors in a packetized elementary stream as a recognized error as recited in Claim 25.

Because Nuber neither discloses nor suggests a method as recited in Claim 25, Claim 25 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Nuber. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 25 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 25 is respectfully solicited. Claims 26-31 depend from allowable Claim 25 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 26-31 include additional patentable subject matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuber in view of Bock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,948,119), hereinafter "Bock."

Claim 12 recites a method of handling errors in a system for receiving packet streams, the method comprising the steps of: enabling hardware detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field of a register, the condition that identifies an asserted indicator in a packet as a recognized error; receiving the packet; determining if the packet includes the asserted indicator; and performing an error recovery operation when the packet includes the asserted indicator.

Claim 12 has been amended to more clearly specify that the enabling is accomplished by asserting a field in a register (and not that the condition is by asserting a field of a register.) Neither Nuber nor Bock, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest enabling hardware detection of a condition, the enabling by asserting a field of a register as recited in Claim 12.

For at least the reasons stated above, Claim 12 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Nuber and Bock. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 12 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 12 is respectfully solicited. Claims 13-19 depend from allowable Claim 12 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 13-19 include additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 22-24, 32-45 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuber et al in view of Galbi, (U.S. Pat. No. 5,768,292). Claims 22-24 depend from allowable Claim 20 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 22-24 include additional patentable subject matter. Claim 45 has been canceled.

Claim 32 recites a method of handling errors in a system for receiving packet stream packets, the method comprising the steps of: receiving at least a portion of a packet; determining if an error occurred based upon the portion of the packet; setting a register field to enable

sending an error indicator; sending an error indicator, when the register field is set, to a video decoder processor when it is determined the error occurred.

The Office has not shown where in Nuber or Galbi "setting a register field to enable sending an error indicator" as recited in Claim 32 is disclosed. In addition, the Office has not shown where in Nuber or Galbi "sending an error indicator, when the register field is set, to a video decoder processor when it is determined the error occurred" as recited in Claim 32 is disclosed. Neither Nuber nor Galbi disclose or suggest "setting a register field to enable sending an error indicator" or "sending an error indicator, when the register field is set, to a video decoder processor when it is determined the error occurred" as recited in Claim 32.

For at least the reasons stated above, Claim 32 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Nuber and Galbi. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 32 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 32 is respectfully solicited. Claims 33-44 depend from allowable Claim 32 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 33-44 include additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 58 recites a method of handling errors in a system for receiving transport packets including: monitoring a plurality of transport packets in a data stream; sending a first status code to a destination to indicate no error has occurred with respect to a specific transport packet; and sending a second status code to the destination to indicate the transport packet is scrambled and is part of a packetized elementary stream.

The Office has not shown where in Nuber or Galbi "sending a first status code to a destination to indicate no error has occurred with respect to a specific transport packet" as recited in Claim 58 is disclosed. In addition, the Office has not shown where in Nuber or Galbi "sending a second status code to the destination to indicate the transport packet is scrambled and is part of a packetized elementary stream" as recited in Claim 58 is disclosed. Neither Nuber nor Galbi disclose or suggest "sending a first status code to a destination to indicate no error has occurred with respect to a specific transport packet" or "sending a second status code to the

destination to indicate the transport packet is scrambled and is part of a packetized elementary stream" as recited in Claim 58.

For at least the reasons stated above, Claim 58 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Nuber and Galbi. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 58 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 58 is respectfully solicited.

Applicant(s) respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicant(s) would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to issue a formal Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Oct. 8, 2003
Date

Respectfully submitted,

Rita M. Wisor
Rita M. Wisor, Reg. No. 41,382
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 29567
Austin, Texas 78755-9567
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)